DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 374 324 CE 067 268

AUTHOR Imel, Susan
TITLE For the Common Good: Local Interagency Linkage Team. Second Follow-up Report.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center on Education and Training for Employment.
SPONS AGENCY Ohio State Dept. of Education, Columbus. Div. of Vocational and Career Education.
PUB DATE Sep 94
NOTE 47p.; For related reports, see ED 324 514, ED 347 391, and ED 347 406.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Basic Education; *Agency Cooperation; *At Risk Persons; *Coordination; Economically Disadvantaged; Employment Programs; Federal Programs; *Human Services; Job Training; State Programs; Statewide Planning; Strategic Planning; *Team Training; Teamwork; *Technical Assistance; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Linkage; *Ohio

ABSTRACT

"For the Common Good" was designed as a statewide project to facilitate the formation of local interagency linkage teams throughout Ohio to improve services to at-risk youth and adults. The state team conducted three workshops during which 36 local interagency linkage teams were trained. A major portion of each workshop was set aside for development of an action plan. Three follow-up meetings provided support and technical assistance and an opportunity for teams to update their action plans. Findings of two local linkage team follow-up surveys indicated teams used a variety of organizational strategies to help them function, the most frequent being information exchange. Forty-one percent characterized the nature of their linkage teams as collaborative; 30 percent indicated it was cooperative; and 30 percent characterized them as both. Sixty-two percent said the accomplishments would not have been possible without the team. Results of a state team survey showed that respondents felt a block of time to develop a plan was the most important aspect of the workshops and follow-up meetings. They did not necessarily characterize the nature of the work of the local linkage teams as collaborative. A number of recommendations were made: workshops to train additional teams; additional follow-up activities for existing teams; a mentoring program matching experienced with newly formed teams; and shared information. (Appendixes include linkage team action plan objectives; response tabulations for surveys; and list of reported team accomplishments.) (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 374 324

FOR THE COMMON GOOD
LOCAL INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM
SECOND FOLLOW-UP REPORT

Prepared by Susan Imel

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C Hansen

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

for
The Ohio Department of Education
Adult Basic and Literacy Education Section
Division of Vocational and Career Education

Center on Education and Training for Employment
College of Education
The Ohio State University
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

September 1994

CE067268

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FUNDING INFORMATION

Project Title: Adult Basic Education — Staff Development FY 1994

Source of Contract: Ohio Department of Education
Division of Vocational and Career Education
Columbus, Ohio 43266-0308

Contractor: Center on Education and Training for Employment
The Ohio State University
Columbus, Ohio 43210-1090

Executive Director: Ray D. Ryan

Disclaimer: Funds for producing and distributing this publication were provided by the Ohio Department of Education under authority of the Adult Education Act, P.L. 100-27 as amended. Opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the Ohio Department of Education nor the U.S. Department of Education, and no endorsement should be inferred.

Discrimination Prohibited: Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the grounds of race, color, or national origin, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1971 states: "No person in the United States shall, on the basis of sex, be excluded from participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination under any education program or activity receiving federal financial assistance." The Adult Basic Education — Staff Development FY 1994 project, like every program or activity receiving financial assistance from the U.S. Department of Education, must be operated in compliance with these laws.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD v

INTRODUCTION 1

THE BEST-LAID PLANS 5

FOLLOW UP AND FOLLOW THROUGH 9

Follow-Up Meetings 10
Local Linkage Team Follow-Up Surveys 12
State Team Survey 17
Local Linkage Team Proposal Activity 18

THE BOTTOM LINE 21

Conclusions 21
Recommendations 23

APPENDICES

A: LINKAGE TEAM ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES 25

B: RESPONSE TABULATION FOR INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM 1994 FOLLOW-UP SURVEY 35

C: RESPONSE TABULATION FOR STATE TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE: PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM IMPACT . 43

D: TEAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORTED DURING MAY 1993 FOLLOW-UP MEETING 47

FOREWORD

Begun in 1990 as a project to encourage and facilitate local linkages of programs and services serving at-risk families in Ohio, "For the Common Good," is an example of a project whose time has come. Since its inception, 36 local linkage teams have been formed under the project's auspices. Initiated as a result of the Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA), which requires states to make educational services available to participants in the FSA Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program, the project operates under the direction of a team composed of state-level staff.

Although it was established as a means of addressing a specific legislative initiative, "For the Common Good" has also responded to the national trend of collaborative linkages as a strategy for implementing systemic change. During the past 30 years, social, demographic, and economic changes have reshaped families, communities, and schools. These transformations mean that these entities must create new ways of supporting and nurturing education and lifelong learning. A positive result of the changes in society has been the recognition and acknowledgement of the interrelationships among the home, schools, and community as well as among public and private enterprises. However, the current system of delivering services has been structured within discrete categorical boundaries, usually related to professional disciplines and bureaucratic needs. This costly fragmentation within the service delivery system has created a call for collaboration among agencies and within communities to reach goals that cannot be achieved acting singly.

The project, "For the Common Good: Building Linkages for At-Risk Families in Ohio," has addressed the need for interagency collaboration. During a 5-year period the project facilitated the development of 36 local linkage teams in conjunction with the For the Common Good At-Risk State Linkage Team, a joint project of the Ohio Department of Education, the Ohio Department of Human Services, the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, the Ohio Department of Development, the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, and the Ohio Board of Regents. This publication reports follow-up information on the activities of the teams since their formation.

Susan Imel, Project Director, developed the publication. Sandra Kerka, Program Associate, edited the manuscript, and Janet Ray served as word processor operator.

We are pleased to have been a part of the For the Common Good project and to have worked with our colleagues in the Ohio Departments of Education, Human Services, Development, Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services, the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services, and the Ohio Board of Regents.

Ray D. Ryan, Executive Director
Center on Education and Training
for Employment
The Ohio State University

INTRODUCTION

"For the Common Good" is a statewide project with the goal of facilitating the formation of local interagency linkage teams throughout Ohio. These local teams focus on improving services to at-risk youth and adults through the development of collaborative interagency linkages. Since 1990, 36 local linkage teams have been formed under the project's auspices. Initiated as a result of the Family Support Act of 1988 (FSA), which requires states to make educational services available to participants in the FSA Job Opportunities and Basic Skills (JOBS) Training Program, the project operates under the direction of a team composed of state-level staff.

Prior to the passage of the Family Support Act, Ohio had already implemented welfare reform activities in 42 of its 88 counties through the Ohio Fair Work program. Since 1987, an informal network had gradually been established between educators and human services staff at the state level. Implementation of the FSA provided the opportunity to forge stronger connections between educational and support services and to expand the range and capacity of programs for learners at risk.

In the summer of 1989, Ohio formed a team at the state level to facilitate development of linkages between educators and human services staff. Originally composed of representatives from the Ohio Department of Human Services (ODHS) and the Ohio Department of Education (ODE), the state team has been expanded to include representation from Job Training Partnership Ohio (JTP Ohio), located within the Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (OBES); OBES; the Ohio Department of Development (ODD); the Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addiction Services (ODADAS); and the Ohio Board of Regents. The primary focus of the state team is on strengthening both the state and local linkages of programs and services designed to serve

Ohio FSA program participants. The team provides important leadership at the state level for the development of interagency linkages at the local level.

To encourage and facilitate local linkages of programs and services offered to FSA participants, the state team planned and implemented three workshops to train local interagency linkage teams. A total of 36 local linkage teams from throughout Ohio were trained during these 2-day workshops held in April 1990, October 1991, and October 1993. The workshops were designed to provide sufficient planning time for teams to draft an action plan for guiding their activities during the following 12 months. Technical assistance in the form of round tables and state-level staff expertise was available to teams as well.

Teams attending the workshops were required to have members representing the following areas: adult basic education, vocational education, Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA), human services, and OBES. For the 1993 workshop, they were also strongly encouraged to have representatives from their local ODADAS boards and community action agencies. Beyond these requirements, each team filled its roster according to local community needs and preexisting linkages. Some teams included representation from such groups as the Urban League, postsecondary education, and family development centers.

Although evaluations of the three 2-day workshops were overwhelmingly positive, the success of these programs can be judged only on the basis of subsequent team activities. Did the workshops serve as a catalyst for launching interagency teams? Were teams successful in following through on their action plans? Have they improved client services? In other words, were the workshops successful in stimulating interagency linkage teams that worked?

This report provides data on the team activities that have transpired following the workshops. Most of the report is based on information collected in 1994 from a follow-up survey of teams and a survey of state team members. However, the report also contains information

that was obtained at other points during the 54-month period since the first workshop. Because they provide a baseline from which to evaluate ensuing activities, the objectives from the teams' action plans are also included. Some information contained in a previous report, ***Local Interagency Linkage Team Follow-Up Report***,* (Imel 1992), is also included here; this report follows the same outline as the 1992 report.

---

* Imel, Susan. *Local Interagency Linkage Team Follow-Up Report. Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team Project*. Columbus: Center on Education and Training for Employment, The Ohio State University, 1992. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 406)

THE BEST-LAID PLANS

A major portion of each workshop was set aside for the development of a team action plan, using an established format. The action plan form contained space for recording the following: information about team members; priority needs of area; sources of needs information; target audience definition; purpose/goal; objectives, including procedures, person(s) responsible, and anticipated completion date; evaluation criteria; products; and dissemination plan. At the end of the 2-day workshop, each team turned in a draft copy of its action plan. Following the April 1990 and October 1991 workshops, teams later mailed a final copy of the plan to the state team. In addition, teams also developed draft action plans at a follow-up meeting held in May 1993.

The objectives in the action plans are the best available representation of team intentions. They have been coded and grouped according to categories based on the content of the objectives. Table 1 shows the results of this analysis, comparing the action plans from each of the three workshops and from the May 1993 follow-up meeting.

Most of the team objectives from the initial workshops related to either providing or enhancing client services (items 1 and 5). Compared to teams that attended the first workshop, teams that attended the second and third workshops had more objectives that were concerned with developing and fostering linkages, as did teams at the May 1993 follow-up meeting. Perhaps the teams that attended the first workshop were the early innovators or early adopters, with a firm commitment to linkages, whereas the teams attending the October 1991 and October 1993 workshops may have needed more time to work on the process of linkage development. Revised and updated action plans of experienced teams, attending the May 1993 follow-up meeting,

TABLE 1
ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES ANALYSIS

Responses coded into the following categories according to content of objective:	October 1993		May 1993 (follow-up)		October 1991		April 1990	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Client programs and services including	16	33	13	23	15	23	24	38
a. transportation	(3)	(6)	(1)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(3)	(5)
b. child care	(3)	(6)	(2)	(4)	(4)	(6)	(3)	(5)
c. other	(10)	(20)	(10)	(18)	(7)	(11)	(18)	(28)
2. Developing and fostering linkages	8	16	11	19	14	21	5	8
3. Information	6	12	4	7	8	12	6	10
a. for agencies	(6)	(12)	(2)	(4)	(6)	(9)	(6)	(10)
b. for clients	—	—	(2)	(4)	(2)	(3)	—	—
4. Communication	3	6	8	14	4	6	7	11
5. Enhancing services to clients	11	22	6	11	16	24	15	24
6. Staff training/inservice	1	2	5	8	3	5	—	—
7. Funding	1	2	4	7	3	5	—	—
8. Other	3	6	6	11	3	5	6	10
TOTAL	9	99*	57	100	66	101*	63	101*

*Total does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

devoted 33 percent of their objectives to either linkages or communication (items 2 and 4). The emphasis on these activities could be interpreted as an acknowledgement of the time and effort needed to achieve successful, local interagency collaboration. It could also indicate the desire of established teams to extend their initial efforts.

Appendix A contains the list of individual team action plan objectives that were used in developing table 1. The code assigned to each objective is included in parentheses following the objective.

FOLLOW UP AND FOLLOW THROUGH

A great deal of anecdotal information exists about the progress of the local linkage teams. At nearly every meeting of the state team, a state staff member reports on the activities of one or more of the local linkage teams. These reports are generally positive, indicating that teams are making progress in developing linkages and implementing their action plans.

An example of this type of anecdotal report is the following illustration of how agencies represented on one local linkage team collaborated to provide services for JOBS clients. In the community served by this particular team, the local adult basic and literacy education (ABLE) program director had been trying to schedule ABLE classes in the public housing site where many JOBS clients resided. However, no space was available. Following the formation of the team—on which the ABLE program was represented—and attendance at the 2-day workshop, the local housing authority director was invited to become a member of the team. Once the housing director became aware of the situation, she petitioned the federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) officials for a waiver that would allow a unit to be used for instructional programs. (When a site has no vacancies, HUD regulations do not permit space to be used for purposes other than housing.) HUD officials gave their permission to use a unit for ABLE programs, but then the problem of how to furnish it needed to be solved. That dilemma was resolved through the cooperation of the county department of human services that opened its warehouse to the ABLE program staff, who were able to obtain furniture and equipment for the new site. An open house was held to "open" the center and now the ABLE director and the housing director—and other linkage team members—are collaborating on a Gateway grant application.

The type of anecdotal information that has been reported about the local teams has been difficult to quantify. More formal information about the work of the teams was collected on the following occasions: during three follow-up meetings held in June 1991, May 1993, and April 1994; from a 1992 follow-up survey sent to the teams that attended either the April 1990 or October 1991 workshops; from a 1994 follow-up survey sent to teams that attended one of the three workshops; and from a 1994 survey of state team members asking for their assessment of the work of the teams. In addition, the opportunity for local linkage teams to apply for JTPA State Education Coordination Grants in the Spring of 1994 provided additional information about teams.

Follow-Up Meetings

Three follow-up meetings have been held for representatives of teams that have attended the workshops. The major purpose of these meetings has been to provide ongoing support and technical assistance to teams as well as an opportunity for them to update their action plans.

In June 1991, representatives of 8 of the 14 teams that had attended the April 1990 workshop participated in a 2-day follow-up meeting. Team representatives gave oral reports on their accomplishments during the 15 months since the initial workshop, but no written record was made of this session. An end of the meeting evaluation indicated that 28 percent of the participants rated their team's progress in carrying out its first year's action plan as "*excellent*," whereas 33 percent rated it "*very good*," 22 percent thought it was "*good*," and 17 percent judged it "*fair*."

The teams that attended this follow-up meeting were still active and interested in continuing their interagency linkage development. Several individuals expressed a need to have team

networking opportunities on a regular basis. Lack of time was the most frequently mentioned deterrent to the work of the linkage teams.

In May 1993, a second follow-up meeting was held for teams that had attended either the April 1990 or the October 1991 workshops. Representatives of 11 teams attended this meeting: 3 from the April 1990 workshop and 8 from the October 1991 workshop. As a part of the meeting, teams reported on their accomplishments. These accomplishments were recorded and are included as Appendix D; they have also been used in analysis comparing action plan objectives with accomplishments (see table 2, p. 16). On the meeting evaluation form, 45 percent of the participants completing the form rated their team's progress in carrying out its previous action plan as "*excellent*," 41 percent rated it as "*very good*," and 14 percent rated it "*good*." None rated it "*fair*."

Many of the responses to open-ended questions on the evaluation form testified to the value of the follow-up meeting for the following reasons: it permitted teams uninterrupted time to work together (mentioned by many), and it afforded teams an opportunity to network in an informal atmosphere. The evaluations also contained many suggestions that led to substantial changes in the third follow-up meeting.

Held in April 1994, the third follow-up meeting was hosted by one of the local linkage teams, so for the first time, the Common Good project went "on the road." Based on evaluations from the previous follow-up meeting, the 1994 meeting was planned as a 1-day event; however, teams were given the option of attending team development activities the previous day. Representatives of 10 teams took advantage of the team development activities: 6 of these teams had attended the October 1993 workshop; 3 had attended the October 1991 workshop; and 1 had attended the April 1990 workshop. The following day, 13 teams took part in the 1-day follow-up meeting: 7 from the October 1993 workshop, 4 from the October 1991 workshop, and 2

from the April 1990 workshop. (A total of 14 teams were represented during the 2-day event since 1 team—from the October 1993 workshop—participated only in the team development activities.)

Teams were given 3 minutes to report on their accomplishments, but no written account was made of these reports due to the fact that the 1994 follow-up questionnaire was being mailed to team leaders within 2 months of the meeting. On the revised 1994 follow-up meeting evaluation form, there was no opportunity for respondents to rate the progress of their team in achieving its previous action plan. The form did ask if the meeting's goal of permitting teams an opportunity to plan for future work was achieved. Of those completing the evaluation, 75 percent said "*yes*," 25 percent said "*partially*," and none said "*no*." Most (50 percent) agreed that the greatest value of the meeting was the "*opportunity for team to work uninterrupted*," with 31 percent saying, "*opportunity to plan for future activities*." Also, 93 percent said there should be future follow-up meetings for teams.

Local Linkage Team Follow-Up Surveys

By far the most complete picture of team activities and accomplishments has been obtained from two local linkage team follow-up surveys, the first in 1992 and the second in 1994. In 1992, a questionnaire was sent to a total of 27 team leaders: 13 from the April 1990 workshop and 14 from the October 1991 workshop. A total of 23 or 85 percent of the questionnaires were completed and returned. Ten of the 13 teams (77 percent) from the April 1990 workshop and 13 of the 14 (93 percent) from the October 1991 workshop returned questionnaires. Only 2 of the 23 teams responding indicated they were "inactive."

In June 1994, a similar follow-up questionnaire was sent to 36 teams: 12 from the April 1990 workshop, 13 from the October 1991 workshop, and 11 from the October 1993 workshop.

(During the 2 years between follow-up surveys, some teams became inactive and asked to be removed from the mailing list; therefore, the number of teams for the April 1990 and October 1991 workshops differs from that of the 1992 survey.)

A total of 31 questionnaires or 85 percent were returned. Nine of the 12 teams (75 percent) from the April 1990 workshop, 11 of the 13 teams (85 percent) from the October 1991 workshop, and all 13 (100 percent) of the teams from the October 1993 workshop returned questionnaires.

As in the 1992 survey, both the cover memo accompanying the questionnaire and the questionnaire itself encouraged inactive teams to respond, but only 4 (11 percent) of the 31 teams responding reported their status as "*inactive*": 2 each from the April 1990 and October 1991 workshops. It is probable, however, that some of the nonresponding teams are also inactive. For example, the leader of one of the April 1990 nonresponding teams has moved to another area.

Appendix B contains the complete response tabulation for the 1994 follow-up survey. (Information for the 1992 survey is available in Imel [1992].**) Some of the highlights are as follows:

- Most (52 percent) of the respondents indicated that "*rural*" best describes the area covered by the linkage team, with four additional respondents—14 percent—indicating their team is a combination of either rural and suburban (3) or metropolitan and rural. The next most frequently marked response was "*urban*," chosen by 30 percent of the respondents.

- Most (52 percent) of the teams have 5-10 members, with 37 percent reporting 11-15 members. In 1992, 67 percent of the responding teams indicated they had 5-10 members and only 19 percent had 11-15.

** Imel, Susan. *Local Interagency Linkage Team Follow-Up Report. Ohio At-Risk Linkage Team Project*. Columbus: Center on Education and Training for Employment, The Ohio State University, 1992. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 247 406)

- All active responding teams have JTPA representatives but 96 percent also have representatives from ABLE, vocational education, and JOBS. In addition, 78 percent report OBES representation, a large increase compared to the 1992 survey, when only two teams reported OBES representation.

- When asked to rank aspects of the workshops and/or the follow-up meetings, 9 or 38 percent of the respondents ranked "*Block of time to develop a plan*" first, followed by "*Opportunity to network with other teams and learn from their experiences*," ranked first by 4 or 17 percent.

- Only 5 or 20 percent of respondents said that their team would **not** have been established without the workshop, whereas 12 or 48 percent said it would have. The balance, 8 (32 percent) were not sure. Most of those responding "*yes*" indicated that there was a linkage in place prior to the workshop. These figures are somewhat different than those reported in 1992 when 43 percent of the respondents said their team would **not** have been established without the workshop, with 38 percent indicating it would have.

- Most (37 percent) teams meet monthly. A number of teams (26 percent) indicated that in addition to regular meetings, i.e., either monthly or quarterly, they also meet on an "as needed" basis.

- Teams have used a variety of organizational strategies to help them function, the most frequent being information exchange (96 percent), followed by frequent communication (89 percent) and shared leadership function and updated action plan (each 63 percent).

- Most (41 percent) respondents characterized the nature of their linkage teams as "*collaborative*" and 30 percent indicated it was "*cooperative*." An additional 30 percent characterized the nature of their linkages as both "*collaborative*" and "*cooperative*." These figures closely parallel those reported in 1992, with a slight increase (4 percent) using the term "*collaborative*."

- When asked if the activities listed as accomplishments would have occurred without the linkage team, 62 percent indicated "*no*," with an additional 19 percent saying "*probably not*" or "*not to the degree [they have been]*."

- Forty percent of the respondents indicated that they would like additional assistance from the State At-Risk Linkage Team.

Of most significance in terms of this follow-up report were the responses to the question, "What have been your team's major accomplishments?" A total of 74 items were listed in response to this open-ended question. For the purposes of comparison, these responses have been

grouped into the same categories used for analyzing the action plan objectives. Table 2 compares the analysis of the items listed as accomplishments in both the 1994 and 1992 follow-up surveys and the accomplishments reported at the 1993 follow-up meeting with the analysis of the action plan objectives. Although table 1 (p. 6) lists the objectives from the action plans separately, in table 2 they have been combined. Also, several categories have been added to accommodate the type of accomplishments reported in the follow-up survey.

Care must be taken in comparing these results. In the 1994 survey, 11 of the 27 teams reporting accomplishments had been functioning only since October 1993, when their initial action plan was developed. In addition since objectives were included from one set of action plans collected at the 1993 follow-up meeting, some teams are represented twice. Also, no effort was made to correlate team objectives with reported accomplishments, that is, match action plans against individual team responses in the follow-up survey.

As observed in the 1992 report, there are discrepancies between what was planned (objectives) and what was reported as accomplishments. Based on the information reported, the teams are spending less time than planned providing client programs and services and enhancing services to clients. Sixty-four percent of action plan objectives fall into the categories of 1 (client programs and services) or 5 (enhancing services to clients) but only 35 percent of the accomplishments reported in the 1994 survey fall into one of these categories.

What was the role of the linkage team in these accomplishments? According to 62 percent of the respondents, they would not have been possible without the team, with an additional 19 percent giving at least partial credit to the team. Some typical comments about the role of the linkage team in the reported accomplishments include the following:

- *All of these things happened because of the linkage team. We have a more positive outlook because we understand more about the other agencies and programs that are involved.*

TABLE 2
COMPARISON OF REPORTED ACCOMPLISHMENTS WITH ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES

Responses coded into the following categories according to content of accomplishment or objective:	List of accomplishments from 1994 follow-up survey		List of accomplishments reported at 1993 follow-up meeting		List of accomplishments from 1992 follow-up survey		Action Plan Objectives	
	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
1. Client programs and services	11	15	7	13	12	22	39	30
2. Developing and fostering linkages	8	11	13	24	11	20	19	15
3. Information gathering/sharing	8	11	5	9	3	5	14	11
4. Communication	16	22	8	15	10	18	11	9
5. Enhancing services to clients	15	20	5	9	9	16	31	24
6. Staff training/inservice	4	5	6	11	—	—	3	2
7. Funding	6	8	3	6	3	5	3	2
8. Other	1	1	4	7	—	—	9	7
9. Mechanics of team operation	4	5	1	2	4	7	—	—
10. Influencing policymakers/community decisionmakers	1	1	2	4	1	2	—	—
11. Product development	1	1	2	4	2	4	—	—
TOTAL	74	99*	54	100	55	99*	129	100

*Total does not equal 100 percent due to rounding.

- *No. It takes time to learn to trust and spending meeting and planning time together can lead to a trusting partnership. It sure has.*

- *No. The accomplishments are a group effort. No one person or agency could implement such things as a universal release of information.*

State Team Survey

The two follow-up linkage team surveys have generated the most complete information on teams and their activities since the project's beginning, but they represent only the team perspective. In an effort to collect additional information about the impact of local linkage teams, state team members were asked to respond to a survey. The goal of the survey was to collect state team members' perceptions of the impact of local interagency linkage teams, i.e., to try to quantify some of the anecdotal information reported in meetings.

Fifteen of the 16 state team members returned questionnaires; however, since 1 was blank, only 14 were used in the analysis. Appendix C includes the complete response tabulation for this survey. Some highlights are as follows:

- Respondents were evenly split on their experience with the project. Four (29 percent) of the respondents have been with the team since its founding, 4 (29 percent) less than 1 year, 2 (14 percent) more than 2 years, and 2 (14 percent) more than 3 years.

- Like the local linkage teams, state team members responding to the survey felt that a block of time to develop a plan was the most important aspect of the workshops and follow-up meetings. Seven or 50 percent rated it the number one aspect of these activities.

- Unlike local linkage teams, however, state team members did not necessarily characterize the nature of the work of local linkage teams as "*collaborative*." Not surprisingly, since they were responding with a variety of teams in mind, state team members' responses to this item varied far more than did those of the teams. Although none of the responding teams characterized the nature of their work as "*Still stuck on 'turf' issues*," three state team members (25 percent) included this choice as a part of their response. For example, one state team member responded "*varies*" and marked all responses.

State team members were also asked to describe any team accomplishments of which they were aware. Although some listed specific accomplishments, others spoke more generally about the effect of the local linkage teams. For example, Ohio's Even Start Coordinator commented on the relationship of the linkage project to Ohio's Even Start projects. Approximately one-third

of the Even Start project coordinators participate on local linkage teams, which can provide a vehicle for the ongoing cooperation necessary to support Even Start projects. Another state team member observed that, overall, linkage teams have been responsible for improved communication and coordination of services among the various agencies, a decrease in duplication of services, improved services to JOBS and LEAP participants, and maximizing resources among the local programs. When asked if the activities they listed would have been accomplished without the local linkage teams(s), 7 or 77 percent of the state team members responding said "*no*," but 2 or 22 percent answered "*not sure*."

Although there are some consistencies between responses provided by the state team members and those of the linkage teams, state team members tended to have a broader perspective about the project. That, of course, is to be expected since most of the state team members are in positions that permit them to acquire knowledge about a number of the local linkage teams.

Local Linkage Team Proposal Activity

In Spring 1994, local linkage teams that had been formed under the auspices of the Common Good project were given the unprecedented opportunity to apply for JTPA State Education Coordination Grants under Section 123 of the Federal Job Training Partnership Act that sets aside 8 percent for state education coordination and grants. Through this grant a total of $300,000 was made available, with a maximum grant amount of $30,000. The request for proposal (RFP) specified that applicants were restricted to existing Common Good Linkage Teams that participated in the Common Good Institutes from 1990 to 1993.

The RFP was sent to the 36 teams that were considered "active" as of April 1994. Twenty teams (55 percent) submitted proposals in response. Of these, 10 received grants of

$30,000 for projects that will enhance their interagency coordination. Six of the projects are putting major emphasis on establishing computer communication systems for service providers to enhance client services.

Of the 20 teams submitting proposals, 4 (20 percent) had attended the April 1990 workshop, 7 (35 percent) the October 1991 workshop, and 9 (45 percent) the October 1993 workshop. Looked at another way, 33 percent (4 of 12) of the teams from April 1990 applied, 64 percent (7 of 11) from October 1991, and 82 percent (9 of 11) from October 1993 applied. Five of the applicants from both the October 1991 and October 1993 workshops were funded, whereas none of the applicants from the April 1990 workshop received a grant.

Thirteen (65 percent) of the 20 teams that submitted applications participated in the April 1994 follow-up meeting, that is, all but one of the 14 teams participating in the April 1994 follow-up meeting submitted a grant application. Seven (70 percent) of the 10 teams that were funded were at the April 1994 follow-up meeting. The remaining three contacted the project director prior to the meeting to discuss the grant application, which was being released at the meeting.

THE BOTTOM LINE

What conclusions can be drawn from the data collected during the course of the project? Did the initial and follow-up workshops succeed in creating effective interagency linkage teams? Can factors be identified that contribute to successful linkages? Have services for clients been improved as a result of Common Good linkage activities? The conclusions that follow address these and other questions. A series of recommendations related to the local linkage teams concludes the section.

Conclusions

Based on information from the team follow-up surveys, the workshops and follow-up meetings have been important elements in the life of the reporting teams. Although only 20 percent of the teams responding to the 1994 follow-up survey said that their team would **not** have been established without the workshop, many of those responding "*not sure*" or "*yes*" to this question acknowledged the role of the workshop in helping formalize existing relationships.

Increasingly, the follow-up meetings have provided a vehicle for team networking, and responses on the April 1994 meeting evaluation form indicate that at least some team members desire more opportunities to learn from the experiences of other teams. The following comments in response to the item "Do you have any suggestions for improvements in future activities for linkage teams?" are indicative of this trend: "*more indepth information sharing among groups*," "*same format with additional time to plan with own team and network with other teams*," "*weekend retreat to share information and collaborate with other teams*," "*more sharing between teams*," and "*similar only should present list of accomplishments, obstacles, etc. with enough copies to share, then give time for groups to get together with others who were success-*

ful." At the time of the 1992 follow-up report, only one follow-up meeting had been held, making it difficult to assess the value of such activities to the teams. Two years, later it is more apparent that many teams consider follow-up meetings an important aspect of their work.

On the basis of reported information, it also appears that many of the teams' accomplishments are designed to assist at-risk clients and that these accomplishments would not have occurred without the team. A number of teams are engaged in activities that will either provide additional client services or enhance existing ones. What this information does not reveal is whether these accomplishments have actually resulted in improved client services. A different type of evaluation is needed to collect those data.

Some evidence exists that there may be greater attrition among teams formed in April 1990 than among teams from the subsequent workshops. Based on the level of participation of these teams in the 1994 follow-up survey, the May 1993 and April 1994 follow-up meetings, and the proposal submission opportunity, it can be concluded that compared to teams formed in October 1991 and October 1993, the April 1990 teams are less active in Common Good-sponsored activities.

The information included in this report together with the 1992 report and the anecdotal information collected over the course of the project provides evidence that—

- the workshops and the follow-up meetings had a positive effect on the development of local interagency linkage teams throughout Ohio;
- many teams are engaged in activities that are designed to improve services for at-risk clients; and
- timely follow-up activities may be an important element in sustaining team life.

Recommendations

Recommendations about interagency linkage teams and their activities include the following:

- Hold workshops to train additional teams. Feedback from team members at the conclusion of the workshops and in subsequent contacts has been very positive about the value of the workshops as a means of organizing the teams. Also, the current climate calls for interagency collaboration to provide client-centered, integrated service delivery. Communities that form local linkage teams will be much better positioned to compete for scare resources.

- Provide additional follow-up activities for existing teams. Responses on the evaluation forms clearly indicate that those teams participating desire continuation of follow-up meetings. Not all teams may want or need this support, but for many it will provide important reinforcement for continuing their work, especially for those teams who did not receive coordination grants. Follow-up meetings provide important opportunities for teams to network and share successes and failures and to update their action plans.

- Establish a mentoring program that matches experienced teams with newly formed teams. Many of the current linkage teams have creatively addressed deterrents to collaboration and have much to share. A mentoring program can provide a means of assisting new teams as well as helping more experienced teams understand the value of their accomplishments.

- Continue to document and share team accomplishments. Not only is this type of information important to provide impact data but also it can provide teams with ideas for improving their linkage work.

- Continue to provide resources for teams. In addition to information about relevant Ohio programs and services, teams need general information on strategies and steps for developing effective, collaborative linkages.

APPENDIX A

LINKAGE TEAM ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES

ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES—OCTOBER 1993 INSTITUTE

Team 1—Jefferson County

1. To establish an educational plan to meet the needs of dropouts under 18 years old (1c)***
2. To establish an effective referral system within the community (5)
3. To explore a centralized system in order to prevent duplication of assessment (5)
4. To assist clients in overcoming barriers in achieving their educational and/or occupational goals (1c)
5. To provide cross-training for staff of community agencies (6)

Team 2—Cleveland Heights

1. To develop a shared understanding of our participants' needs and characteristics (3a)
2. To bring each agency together to act cooperatively and not in isolation (2)
3. To develop a participant-centered, proactive team (2)

Team 3—Columbus State Community College (Franklin County)

1. To motivate students to stay in school and graduate (1c)
2. To analyze available resources germane to teen parent issues (3a)
3. To link high school graduates with continued education and training (5)
4. To involve entire family (1c)

Team 4—Crawford Linkages

1. To institute an advisory board of administrators and community resources to gain support (2,4)
2. To increase the unity and cooperation between our agencies (2)
3. To address our needs assessment list (8)

Team 5—Findlay-Hancock County

1. To dissolve barriers which currently exist in Hancock County that prevent collaboration of services (2)
2. To provide a common, comprehensive vocational assessment and evaluation (5)
3. To serve as a clearinghouse for adult education and literacy programs (5)
4. To identify funding sources through the development of short and long-term strategies (7)
5. To develop a public relations plan to secure community support for our mission (4)

Team 6—Highland County Linkage Team

1. To establish a regularly scheduled collaborative meeting (4)
2. To identify the areas of duplication of services (3a)
3. To develop common forms (5)
4. To educate clients as to what training services are available (1c)
5. To identify existing jobs in Highland County area and the skills needed for those (3a)
6. To explore the possibilities in the areas of child care and transportation (1a&b)

*** Number assigned in coding responses.

Team 7—Lancaster/Fairfield County

1. To establish viable transportation system to get JOBS, LEAP, or other students to schools, OU-L (Ohio University at Lancaster), JVS, LCS, by using current bus system or city and county schools (1a)
2. To identify current linkages that are presently diversified and unite them for the common good of the family as opposed to the individual (2)
3. To encourage development of on-site child care centers and expand those that already exist (1b)
4. To promote a one-stop services delivery system (5)
5. To research the possibility of access to the CRIS-E system to allow all related agencies to view or inquire for information without breaching confidentiality (5)

Team 8—Lucas County

1. To strengthen coordination efforts between agencies assisting the JOBS participants in target group (2)
2. To identify characteristics and barriers of the targeted population (3a)
3. To identify job market opportunities in Lucas County and skills needed for those jobs (3a)
4. To provide the business community with incentives to hire individuals from target population (8)
5. To remove barriers for target population to enter job market (1c)

Team 9—Pickaway County

1. To develop a committee of key players that will meet on a regular basis to maintain the focus on our goals (2)
2. To develop more effective and cohesive management and operational procedures (8)
3. To develop a joint case management system (5)

Team 10—Pike County Common Good Team

1. To develop a universal release of information that will be used by all cooperating county agencies (5)
2. To develop and expand child care services for children ages 0-3 (1b)
3. To expand the existing transportation system to increase service availability throughout the county (1a)
4. To develop an Employment Seeking and Keeping Skills program to meet the needs of all county agencies and their clients (5)

Team 11—Washington County Partners

1. To provide education and training opportunities (1c)
2. To promote a comprehensive wellness program (1c)
3. To provide coordinated support services (5)
4. To provide employment opportunities (1c)

ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES—MAY 1993 FOLLOW-UP MEETING

Team 1—Delaware County

1. To increase community awareness of the existence and objectives of the Delaware County Linkage Team (4)
2. To continue to pursue the implementation of GOALS Displaced Homemaker programs for Delaware County (7)
3. To expand full-time programming at the Delaware JVS (1c)
4. To develop programming to encourage at-risk individuals to enter nontraditional occupations (1c)
5. To investigate, develop, and implement a program for dropouts (1c)

Team 2—Fayette County

1. To arrange transportation to college (1a)
2. To develop a system for assisting employed individuals with job retention services (1c)
3. To develop a directory of community services available for participants (3b)
4. To develop a committee to implement these objectives and keep everyone informed (2,4)
5. [To form] Student Advisory Board Committee for S.S.C.C. (2)

Team 3—Greene County Agency Coordination Team

1. To make job opportunities available to other agencies (5)
2. To establish agency inservice day (6)
3. To bring in other key agencies (2)
4. To establish a subcommittee for coordinated placement (2)
5. To explore day care resources in Greene County (1b)
6. To make presentation to county commissioners (4)

Team 4—Buckeye Hills JVS (Galia-Jackson-Vinton)

1. To maintain linkage team (2)
2. To encourage efforts to help at-risk individuals and families to become self-sufficient (4)
3. To continue support for Literacy Coalition (8)
4. To host service provider fair (6)
5. To evaluate linkage team (8)

Team 5—Hocking-Athens-Perry (HAP)

1. To have job fair happen by Spring 1994 (1c)
2. To have a 3-county resource directory completed and accessible by December 1995 (3a)
3. To hold a service fair in Hocking County by Summer 1995 (1c)
4. To make available similar services to all clients in the three county service delivery area (1c)
5. [To provide] additional support and access to services for client (5)

Team 6—Lawrence County At-Risk Team

1. To establish regular communication between Lawrence County secondary and adult education systems, Lawrence County Department of Human Services, and Ohio Bureau of Employment Services (4)
2. To influence policy relating to Project LEAP, JOBS, and JTPA in Lawrence County Education systems, Lawrence County Department of Human Services, LCCAO, and OBES (8)
3. To conduct a follow-up survey of GRADS and ABE participants in Project LEAP, JOBS, and JTPA (8)
4. To expand the educational facilities of ABLE to meet the needs of a growing number of clients (1c)

Team 7—Medina County At-Risk Linkage Team

1. [To develop] outreach to other agencies in the community (2)
2. [To develop] outreach to community at large (4)
3. To investigate funding sources (7)
4. [To hold] combined staff meetings to educate everyone on what each agency does and what the Linkage Team's purpose is (6)
5. To create a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) (2)
6. [To create] multi-agency referral agency (5)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Team 8—Montgomery County/Dayton City At-Risk Linkage Team

1. To increase staff awareness and identification of community services and appropriate use of services (6)
2. To effectively utilize funds available for inner-city families through the cooperative planning of DHS, Dayton Public Schools, JVS, DMHA, and JTPA (2,7)
3. To provide for child care in unique and occasional situations specifically during GED testing (1b)
4. To maintain/monitor attendance and progress procedures to meet needs of each component (5)
5. To develop plan for ongoing contact of key players (4)

Team 9—Scioto County

1. To create a streamlined form (5)
2. To develop an interagency agreement (memorandum of understanding) (2)
3. To develop a control group (8)
4. To develop a resource manual (3a)
5. To develop a resource center (3b)
6. To develop skill-based training programs (1c)

Team 10—Summit County

1. To write grant proposal for common computerized linkage program to be used for accountability and to expedite client services (7)
2. To increase number of JOBS clients who complete the GED test successfully (8)
3. To develop client retention strategies in JOBS 60/40 contracts (1c)
4. To continue to develop linkages with JOBS 60/40 contracts and JTPA (2)

Team 11—Warren County

1. To develop a career plan that involves each agencies' required information and deletes duplication of services (5)
2. To expand the involvement of agencies, schools, and community as well as business and industry on the linkage team (2)
3. To develop an inservice plan for interagencies (6)
4. To schedule monthly meetings to foster communication and share funding concerns of the linkage team (4)

ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES—APRIL 1990 INSTITUTE

Team 1—Jefferson County

1. To instill an appreciation for learning early in life (1)
2. To assist in overcoming barriers to high school graduation/equivalency (5)
3. To obtain high school diploma or equivalency (1)
4. To obtain postsecondary education/job skills training, if necessary (1)
5. To obtain specific job-related training (1)

Team 2—Eastland Vocational School District

1. To make available adequate child care (1)
2. To make transportation available (1)
3. To establish and maintain regular communication channels (4)
4. To provide education and training services based on client need (1)
5. To access human service system to provide financial public assistance and other special services for potential clients (5)

Team 3—Lawrence County JVS

1. To establish regular communication between Lawrence County Education systems and Lawrence County Department of Human Services and Lawrence County Community Action Organization (4)
2. To influence policy in Lawrence County Education systems, Lawrence County Department of Human Services, and Lawrence County Action Organizations (8)
3. To conduct a follow-up survey of GRADS and ABE participants in Project LEAP, JOBS, and JTPA (8)

Team 4—Auglaize County

1. To link with already existing social service meetings to educate each about individual agencies (2)
2. To develop an agency-wide referral system to eliminate frustration and confusion on part of client (5)
3. To develop a transportation system to enable clients to access programs available (1)

Team 5—Montgomery County

1. To increase staff awareness and identification of community services to enhance referral process (3a)
2. To increase community/consumer awareness and appropriate use of services (4)
3. To develop a common definition of job readiness (5)
4. To explore possibility of a central assessment center (5)
5. To establish linkage and/or contracts with service providers (2)
6. To establish procedures for effective and efficient reporting (8)

Team 6—Tri-County JVS

1. To identify the services each agency or educational institution provides to at-risk populations in our geographical area (3a)
2. To initiate more cooperation between the intake facility in making referrals of potential clients to other agencies and/or educational institutions (5)
3. To provide better access for participants to programs (5)

Team 7—Warren County

1. Transportation (1)
2. Housing (1)
3. Child care (1)
4. Contracting LEAP (1)
5. Local coordination (2)
6. Job development (1)
7. Develop training programs for JOBS (1)

Team 8—Lorain County

1. To establish ongoing communications among Lorain County Human Services, education and training providers, and other pertinent agencies (4)
2. To provide a marketing plan to assist Lorain County Human Services in implementing JOBS/LEAP programs (5)
3. To expand basic education opportunities for LEAP and JOBS clients (1)
4. To increase access to vocational/technical training for JOBS/LEAP clients (5)
5. To provide supportive services to JOBS/LEAP clients (1)

Team 9—Belmont County

1. To ensure productive cooperation between Belmont County Department of Human Services, Belmont Career Center, and JTPSO Belmont County (2)
2. To ensure that educational programs meet local employment opportunities (8)
3. To provide indepth client assessments including career counseling (1)
4. To provide client support services resulting in successful completion of training (1)
5. To develop job opportunities for job-ready clients (1)
6. To provide post-employment support to ensure job retention (1)
7. To stimulate local economic development (8)
8. To increase child care availability (1)

Team 10—Portage County

1. The coordinators will increase accessibility of programs to participants by June, 1991 (5)
2. The coordinators will expand and improve the networking of service providers by June, 1991 (2)
3. The coordinators will establish a system to identify at-risk participants by June, 1991 (3a)

Team 11—Licking County

1. To develop a common database (5)
2. To improve communications between schools, service providers, and potential employers (4)
3. To identify and provide appropriate services for clients by developing resources in the community (5)
4. To identify educational and training needs (3a)
5. To affect self-concept/attitude of clients (1)

Team 12—Adams County

1. Improve and expand ongoing regular communication between county service agencies (4)
2. Develop resource directory with referral procedure guide (5, 3a)
3. Present and inform local board of education and administration regarding needs for adult vocational education (8)
4. Provide job training services to adult clients (1)

Team 13—Hamilton County

1. To improve communication among cooperating agencies (4)
2. To identify clients who are eligible for and/or in need of supportive services to participate in educational and training programs (3a)
3. To develop improved procedures for collecting and processing data related to the maintenance of comprehensive client records (5)
4. To develop improved follow-up procedures (5)
5. To provide supportive services (1)

ACTION PLAN OBJECTIVES—OCTOBER 1991 INSTITUTE

Team 1—Hocking-Athens-Perry

1. Involve Perry County agencies in team (2)
2. Try to use the employment and training council meetings quarterly as a useful vehicle for the purpose of fulfilling the goals of our team (2)
3. Will defer to team meetings quarterly if not able to implement #2 successfully (2)

4. Develop career counseling type program for staff/availability of service to clients (6, 1)
5. Work toward having a Job Fair (1)

Team 2—Butler County

1. To identify existing county programs/agencies serving at-risk youth (2)
2. To establish regular communications between programs and agencies (4)
3. To identify the services already in place (3a)
4. To develop a more efficient identification and referral network process for at-risk youth (5)

Team 3—Buckeye JVS

1. To put in place effective linkages among community services (2)
2. To identify employment opportunities (3b)
3. To identify training needs and establish programs to meet them (3a, 1)
4. To identify and secure funding sources (7)
5. To increase public awareness through expanded marketing techniques (4)

Team 4—Ross County

1. Have client information generated at DHS/or PIC; passed through and forwarded (?) to other partners. (reduce duplication of paperwork, record keeping), i.e., print out Chris "e" and transport to PIC for streamlined intake (5)
2. Determine what information is necessary to be returned or provided to DHS, PIC, or Pickaway-Ross relative to client status—What and when? (8)
3. Establish unified case load strategy, i.e., our staff(s) to provide consistent case management to a fixed identifiable group of JOBS clients in employment and training activities. Beginning to end of ? process/ monitor, oversight, support and follow (5)
4. Establish and formalize ongoing process for evaluation, modifying and replanning, i.e., monthly meetings and agenda and determine frequency then on (2)
5. Identification of other partners with vested interests to include in formal structure and discussion, i.e. (OBES, Dept. of Eds, city/county) (2)
6. Examine and aggressively pursue additional funding resources, even through coalition type efforts (7)

Team 5—Ohio Hi-Point JVSD

1. Acquire knowledge of other agencies (3a)
2. Coordinate assessment/intake services (5)
3. Develop strategies for accessing clients (i.e., identify, reach, inform) (5)

Team 6—Mahoning County

1. Develop a formalized network for sharing ideas, concerns, and solutions (2)
2. Develop a uniform assessment to eliminate duplication of testing (5)
3. Define "Job Club," develop an appropriate program to meet the collective needs of all agencies (1)
4. Staff Development—"cross training" to facilitate communication between agencies (6)
5. Information for clients as to the services provided by the agencies and what is expected of the client in order to receive such services (3b)

Team 7—Clermont County

1. To work on system so that the system does not penalize clients seeking transition to self-sufficiency (5)
2. To make transportation a manageable problem (1)
3. To establish a better flow of information and marketing (4)

4. To make child care options more available (1)
5. To create a better referral system (5)

Team 8—Summit County

1. Establish an ongoing coordination team (2)
2. Develop a common referral process to expedite client services (5)
3. Develop a multiagency inservice training program for participating agencies (6)

Team 9—Delaware JVS

1. To regularly communicate program goals, client referrals, projects, and grants/fund sources among area agencies in the Delaware County Linkage Team (2)
2. Delaware JVS will initiate paperwork to generate approval for Pell and OIG grant dissemination (5)
3. Collect information and investigate the implementation of a GOALS Program, effective for the 92-93 school year (3a, 1)
4. To investigate the availability of funds/grants and write proposals for grant monies that will expand the ABE and GED programs (7, 1)
5. To expand child care facilities and services in Delaware County (1)
6. To investigate and implement options which will expand transportation services to our target population (1)

Team 10—Fayette County

Team submitted only a summary with no objectives but with following goal:

> Our goal is to break dependency of Public Assistance recipients by overcoming barriers such as transportation, child care, defaulted student loans, housing and utilities. By doing this, we will need linkage between County Human Service, county educators, and local PIC 17 (1, 2)

Team 11—Scioto County

1. Meeting - Monthly (2)
2. Develop a retention program for GA clients (1)
3. Streamline information gathering procedures, forms, etc. (5)
4. Identify target population that is served by all agencies and improve case management for that client and family (5)
5. Form a plan for teen pregnancy prevention (1)

Team 12—Greene County

1. Identify services provided by other agencies within our area (3a)
2. Identify existing child care services available and proper referral process (1)
3. Search for possible solutions to county transportation problems (1)
4. Improve communication with other agencies (4)

Team 13—Gallia County DHS

1. Establish linkage team (2)
2. Develop need assessment (community needs) (3a)
3. Standardized assessment system (5)
4. Evaluate linkage team (8)

Team 14—Medina County

1. To determine a jointly agreed upon definition of "Job Ready" (5)
2. To determine sequential steps necessary to prepare client for job seeking according to our definition of "Job Ready" (5)
3. To institute a viable (simple, flexible, and timely) client tracking system, preferable computer linkage: a. grant writing sharing; b. continued adjusting/streamlining (5)
4. To network with other agencies/organizations that may be preparing clients for "job readiness" (2)
5. To evaluate preceding plan and develop new plan for the succeeding year in October (8)

APPENDIX B

RESPONSE TABULATION FOR INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM 1994 FOLLOW-UP SURVEY

General Instructions. *Read each question carefully and indicate your response to each item with a checkmark (✓). Please follow* ***carefully*** *the instructions provided with certain questions. Responses will be confidential. Individual teams will not be identified with any of the report narrative covering the results of this survey.* ***IF YOUR TEAM IS INACTIVE, GO DIRECTLY TO PART IV ON PAGE 4.***

PART I. INFORMATION ABOUT THE TEAM

This section collects background information about your team and its location.

1. Which of the following best describes the area covered by your linkage team?

   14/52% a. Rural 1/4% b. Suburban 8/30% c. Urban

   4/15% d. Other (please describe)

   - Combination of rural & suburban (mentioned by 3)
   - Metro/Rural
   - Appalachian (indicated and counted as [a.] Rural — mentioned by 2)

2. Which of the following agencies or areas are currently represented on your linkage team? (Check all that apply.)

   26/96% a. JOBS (DHS) 22/81% b. LEAP (DHS) 7/26% c. Other DHS areas

   26/96% d. Adult Basic Education 27/100% e. JTPA 21/78% f. OBES

   26/96% g. Vocational Education (list area, e.g., GRADS, Displaced Homemaker)

   - GRADS (10)
   - Family Life (2)
   - Displaced Homemaker (3)
   - Adult (3)
   - Transition (3)
   - Administration (2)
   - Secondary (1)
   - Job Club/Training (2)
   - OWE (1)
   - Women's (1)

   11/41% h. Community Action Agency 7/26% i. ODADAS 13/48% j. Higher Education

   14/52% k. Other (Please list)

   - Recently added: Community Action; Drug & Alcohol Treatment; Ohio Industrial Training (Dept of Development); Mental Health Services
   - El Centro & Lorain Co Chamber of Commerce
   - Dayton Metropolitan Housing, Miami Valley Career Technology Center
   - Family Self-Sufficiency (MHA)
   - Decker Family Development Center
   - Metro Housing
   - Head Start

- Even Start
- Literacy Coalition-Public Libraries-Green Thumb, Head Start, Metro Housing Authorities Rehab Center
- Comprehensive Evaluation/Assessment
- Read for Life
- BVR, Courts, VA, Rehab Services Commission, Title V, HUD, HEAP, Head Start, Weatherization, Section 1B Transportation, Job Club
- Columbus Public Schools
- County Health Dept., Drug & Alcohol Recovery Center, Private Industry Council
- Mental Health, Mentally Retarded/Developmentally Delayed
- Compass (substance abuse and treatment agency)
- Lawrence Cooperative for Housing

3. How many individuals are currently on your linkage team?

0/0%	a. less than 5	14/52%	b. 5 to 10
10/37%	c. 11 to 15	3/11%	d. More than 15

PART II. INFORMATION ABOUT THE INSTITUTES AND FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS

This part of the questionnaire asks about the Institutes and Follow-up Meetings sponsored by the State At-Risk Linkage Team.

4. Which of the following Institutes did your team attend?

7/26%	a. April 1990	9/33%	b. October 1991	11/41%	c. October 1993

4a. Which of the following Follow-up Meetings did your team attend? (Check all that apply.)

4/15%	a. June 1991	9/33%	b. May 1993	13/48%	c. April 1994

5. Please rate the following aspects of the Institute/Follow-up Meetings in terms of their importance to the subsequent work of your team. *Place a 1 by the item that was most important, a 2 by the item that was next, and so forth.* ***If an item was not important to the work of the team, do not rate it.*** (24 responded)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7		
9/38%	3/13%	3/13%	4/17%	3/13%	0/0%	0/0%	a.	Block of time to develop a plan
3/13%	4/17%	5/21%	2/8%	4/17%	1/4%	0/0%	b.	Format (i.e. Action Plan Form) for developing a plan
3/13%	3/13%	3/13%	1/4%	2/8%	4/17%	2/8%	c.	Opportunity to become acquainted with team members
1/4%	7/30%	4/17%	5/21%	3/13%	1/4%	0/0%	d.	Availability of technical assistance through round table discussions
3/13%	3/13%	7/30%	2/8%	4/17%	2/8%	0/0%	e.	Opportunity to talk with state-level staff
4/17%	4/17%	2/8%	4/17%	2/8%	5/21%	0/0%	f.	Opportunity to network with other teams and learn from their experiences
0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	g.	Other (please describe)

6. Would your interagency linkage team have been established without the opportunity to attend the Institute?

12/48% a. Yes 8/32% b. Not sure 5/20% c. No

6a. Why or why not?

- We were already established prior to Institute. We all felt 5a. above* was important to re-define goals, completing a written plan & refine some of the objectives.
- In anticipation of becoming a JOBS County we formed a supportive advisory group as an offshoot of the Lorain County Education Consortium.
- This is voluntary and an added part to all the members' jobs. If the state did not push the issue, the team would not have been established.
- We met informally/most times not together
- Some linkages had already been established
- Time and incentive
- Most members on our linkage team were formally networking previous to establishing a formal team but the "team" has helped to organize us more and focus on specific needs & tasks that we may not have otherwise addressed.
- We had been working with other agencies but I don't think we could have accomplished as many tasks so successfully without this kind of linkage efforts.
- Too busy to make necessary connections otherwise.
- We had already started to meet informally and had developed interagency agreements. The institute allowed us to formalize what we were doing and made resource available.
- We had a team established before we attended. The Institute gave us the opportunity to work on our action plan and mission.
- It had been established, but did not have a common goal. We now have a mission, and have implemented part of the Active Plan.
- Our format has always been that we have two agencies meet to discuss action plans. This was the first time that we had a group of agencies together to discuss action plans.
- No time to plan and organize
- It took a "formalized" meeting to get us all together.
- We had begun meeting in larger groups and had reached a point where we lacked direction.
- It was very helpful to have the opportunity to attend the institute which solidified our ideas and helped develop a sense of mission.
- The Department of Human Services already had a task force set up to address issues with JOBS recipients
- We organized a network of local education and employment entities a little over a year previous to the Institute
- Good linkage in place prior to initial meeting

PART III. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR TEAM'S ACTIVITIES

This section of the questionnaire asks about your team's ongoing activities.

7. How frequently does your team meet?

10/37% a. Monthly 4/15% b. Quarterly

2/7% c. Bi-Monthly 3/11% d. As needed

1/4% e. Other (please specify) 3/11% f. B & D

- Weekly 4/15% g. A & D

8. What organizational strategies has your team used to help it function? (Check all that apply.)

24/89% a. Frequent communication

26/96% b. Information exchange

13/48% c. Established task forces or sub-committees

17/63% d. Updated action plan

17/63% e. Shared leadership function

7/26% f. Other (please describe)

- Parts of our team were instrumental in developing JSR programs and a now state-wide comprehensive evaluation program as well as many other copied programs.
- Annual workshop/retreat at local metro park which everyone enjoys
- Common purpose — since we worked with many of the same client/students
- Integrated with another interagency task force
- Knowing what each agency does
- We have monthly luncheons that we see as cross-training forums to inform the group — 30 to 40 individuals — of resources for self-sufficiency
- We address barriers to self-sufficiency by collaborative projects that do problem-solving and brainstorm as needs arise
- Speakers on other resources in the community

9. How would you characterize the nature of your linkage team?

11/41% a. Collaborative, i.e., establishes joint goals and objectives that could not be achieved by a single agency or organization

8/30% b. Cooperative, i.e., helping each other achieve individual agency or organization goals and objectives

0/0% c. Still stuck on "turf" issues

8/30% d. A & B

10. What have been your team's major accomplishments?

- Communication network
- Staff training
- Development of new programs (i.e., Pathways, Jobs Studied Retention at COTC/OSUN; Comprehensive Evaluation; Jumpstart-personal/life skills for; Back on Track [displaced homemaker] program enhancements, development of other programs.
- Successful communication: of projects, JOBS Welfare updates; program development to enhance client opportunities, sharing info & projects
- Service Festival for agency staff
- Referral processes to agencies
- Problems solved - A.B.L.E. Reporting Service/Resource Festival
- Improved communication between team agencies
- Removed barriers and gained access to new information regarding regulation changes within our team and received update on State Legislative changes.
- Streamlining of procedures to enroll in adult ed programs.
- Improved communication
- We need to "formalize" again
- (1) The Finance Committee acquired $4,500.00 to assist with summer school/Enrichment tuition/2nd Time G.E.D. test costs. (Last year's figure was $3,500.00). (2) Honored 26

requests for assistance with tuition for summer school and 1 request for assistance with the cost of taking the G.E.D. test the second time. (3) Developed a logo and stationary for sending meeting announcements to grandparents support group (H.U.G.S.). (4) Attempted to conduct approximately 6 H.U.G.S. meetings throughout county. (5) Developed linkages with other agencies by increasing core and subcommittee memberships. (6) Updating team plan. A copy of revised plan will be sent later this summer.

- Communication improvement
- Some joint case management
- Pursuit of electronic data/exchange
- Increased knowledge about each other's agency
- Expansion of committee to include other agencies
- Development of grants to benefit all agencies
- Still meeting after 3 years and still reaching toward goals set
- Streamlined many areas, i.e., billing, referral, etc.
- Ongoing problem solving
- Good communication between agencies
- Finalized the implementation of the child care facility at the Delaware J.V.S.
- Created stronger linkages with one another who serve many of the same people
- Assisted J.V.S. in the approval of Pell grants
- Co-sponsored J.V.S. Open House/Job Fair
- Elimination of duplication of services
- Community awareness
- Developed a resource manual
- We have all become friends and by this we feel more comfortable expressing our ideas and sharing information
- We keep each other updated with changes
- Meeting goals of action plan: Agency In-Service 93 and 94; Whine and Dine 93; Hosting the Common Good; Followup 94 Conference; Awarded the Common-Good Linkage Team Incentive Grant 94
- To truly begin coordination of services to area residents; to build a Literacy Coalition; to build an "Information & Referral Network; to begin a project that will allow interagency communications via computers; develop a common referral form.
- A multi-agency referral system to connect clients with needed support service: Community Ed Planning & Implementation grants
- Linkage Team Planning grant -
  - Shared client data-base
  - Computer networking
  - Shared resource library
  - Service provider list & phone directory
  - Inter agency staff development
- 30 Agencies signing a "Plan of Cooperation"
- Resource Directory
- Inter Agency Referral
- Plans for a center for career development
- The establishment of a more widely used -
- Release of Information; The collaboration with the Family-Children First Council in Highland County; the reduction of duplication of testing for JOBS participants
- Our major accomplishments are we targeted in on 2 families to help, we are still meeting & co-locating, & WCDHS/OBES have signed a confidentiality agreement in a formal contract to exchange information. Although all of these projects were in the works, the linkage team concept has sped up the time table.
- Working with teen parents to encourage them to finish high school and further their education

- Opening communication lines between agencies; sharing information and educating agencies
- State approval (verbal) for CRIS-E terminals to be located in 3 agencies separate from ODHS; Grant proposal written, signed, submitted for funding this project; meeting regularly and working together; As a result of getting to know one another, networking on behalf of our clients is easier.
- Generic release of information form; exchange of assessment/testing info. o/w linkage team members
- Development of a universal release of information; discussion of developing an Early Childhood Intervention Center; Grant application completed for feasibility study.
- We received a grant to put our plans into action
- Pulled-off Career Expo that had 25 exhibitors and over 600 attenders. Done with cooperation of about 10 agencies
- CARS Project — A transportation project that (1) accepts donated cars, (2) set up a revolving loan fund using the donated cars (unusable cars are salvaged for cash to be part of loan fund). 18 cars are presently on the road for JOBS or JTPA clients going to school or seeking employment. For credit (at Clermont College), Alcohol/Drug awareness training through ODADAS and Clermont Recovery Center (over 45 trained). Creation of eight day event on Career Development and 6-week Summer Enrichment Camp for ADC Teens.
- Keeping all the agencies informed of each other's program changes and updates.
- Information exchange enabling agencies to coordinate services to at risk clientele; keeps coordinating agencies informed during periods of agency change; open communication between line workers.
- Communication between different agencies has been a bonus and helps our students. At-risk students don't fall through cracks.

11. In your judgment, would the activities listed in item 10 been accomplished without the linkage team? Why or why not?

- Probably not. Working together, we developed a sense of trust, we knew capabilities of others in group, turf issues had been resolved.
- The Welfare Reform Committee brought us all to the same table
- Successful communication: of projects, JOBS Welfare updates; program development to enhance client opportunities, sharing info & projects
- No, group effort accomplished things the individual agencies could not have done individually.
- No. The above activities would not have been accomplished without the linkage team. There is no other group established to meet the specific needs of the At-Risk population.
- Not to the extent they have.
- No. Communication is the key. The committee provides the opportunity.
- No. It provided the foundation.
- No, one agency couldn't have done it.
- No. We did not know whom each of us were to be able to share ideas and concerns. We were unaware of what each agency provided.
- No.
- No. Commitment from all involved is a must to accomplish a task of this magnitude!
- No. We would not have gone after funding.
- No. There was no linkage
- Regarding the Release of Information & the testing, it probably would have eventually been accomplished, but would have taken longer.
- Probably not. Although we meet on a regular basis, it was primarily info sharing. Through this project we were able to develop an Action Plan.
- Yes - We have been working together for several years.

- All of these things happened because of the linkage team. We have a more positive outlook because we understand more about the other agencies and programs that are involved.
- No. It takes time to learn to trust, and spending meeting and planning time together can lead to a trusting partnership. It sure has.
- Probably not, since prior to the establishment of our local linkage teams, we never formally met as a group to discuss issues.
- No. The accomplishments are a group effort. No one person or agency could implement such things as a universal release of information.
- No, getting together and working collaboratively is what put everything in motion.
- No, too big a job and too expensive.
- Yes, due to local personnel and the collaborative atmosphere and the financing of our networking efforts.
- No
- Not to degree they are today.

12. Please describe any brochures, pamphlets, or other materials that your team has developed? (NOTE: If possible, send examples of these materials under separate cover to Susan Imel, CETE, 1900 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1090).

- Brochure is currently under development.
- H.U.G.S LOGO
- H.U.G.S. STATIONARY
- Revised R.E.A.P. application
- We are currently working to develop a community service pamphlet & video
- Copies of brochures and list of acronyms/explanation mailed separately to Susan Imel.
- We have developed a literacy resource brochure.
- 1) Logo for team
  2) Multi-Agency brochure
- A brochure & video are being planned. Probably Fall-Winter 1994. The intent is to highlight each agency & show how we can help.
- We are presently working on a linkage team brochure.
- In process.
- We are developing a tri-county resource manual.

13. Would your team like additional assistance from the State At-Risk Linkage Team?

10/40% a. Yes 13/52% b. No

Note: Two (8%) indicated they were <u>not sure</u> or <u>maybe</u>

13a. If Yes, please describe the type of assistance desired.

- Funding
- Regular contact to let us know if we are on a similar path as other teams.
- Help develop more systemic long term changes & impacts.
- Waiver of regulation (mainly procurement issues under JTPA which restrict collaboration & joint planning.
- Bridge or work out confidentiality issues.
- Expand new ideas
- Ability to network at state meetings
- State level advisory/guidance team
- $
- We are always open for suggestions and eager to hear what other agencies are doing. We want to make Ohio as successful as we can by creating new opportunities for our clients.

- We have always appreciated any assistance from the Stat At-Risk Linkage Team and we welcome any assistance we could receive in the future.
- Continued meetings to develop plans - with sufficient advance notice to arrange schedules.
- Feedback; Update of other teams
- Possibly in the future.
- Information on state initiative that can be of help to local efforts and information on funding sources for these types of initiatives.

PART IV. INACTIVE LINKAGE TEAMS

If the linkage team that attended the Institute is inactive, please complete the following questions.

14. Please rate the following factors in terms of their importance in the team becoming inactive. *Place a 1 by the item that was the biggest factor, a 2 by the item that was next, and so forth.* ***If an item was not a factor, do not rate it.***

2/50%	a. Lack of interest	1/25%	b. Scheduling conflicts
0/0%	c. Turf issues	1/25%	d. Other linkage activities took precedence
0/0%	e. Other (please describe)		

15. Approximately how long has the team been inactive?

- 1 year
- 1 year; it had lasted for about one year & we developed a communication system to handle paperwork & client flow types of issues; DHS lost interest after that (Once their immediate problems were solved, they didn't want to take the time to participate.)
- 2 years (mentioned by 2)

PART V. TELEPHONE FOLLOW-UP

If you would be willing to be contacted by telephone to provide more details about the work of your linkage team, please include your name and telephone below:

Name _____

Daytime Telephone ( ) _____

Thank you very much for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. Please use the enclosed envelope to return it by June 22, 1994 to: **Susan Imel, CETE, 1900 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1090.**

APPENDIX C

RESPONSE TABULATION FOR STATE TEAM QUESTIONNAIRE PERCEPTIONS OF LOCAL INTERAGENCY LINKAGE TEAM IMPACT

General Instructions. *Read each question carefully and indicate your response to each item with a checkmark (✓).* Please follow **carefully** the instructions provided with certain questions. Responses will be confidential. **IF YOU FEEL THAT YOU HAVE NOT BEEN A MEMBER OF THE STATE TEAM LONG ENOUGH TO BE FAMILIAR WITH THE PROJECT OR HAVE NOT HAD ENOUGH DIRECT INVOLVEMENT TO BE KNOWLEDGEABLE ABOUT THE LOCAL LINKAGE TEAMS, GO DIRECTLY TO PART IV ON THE BACK.**

PART I. INFORMATION ABOUT YOUR PARTICIPATION ON THE STATE TEAM

This section collects background information about your participation in the state team and its activities.

1. How long have you been a member of the State Team?

4/29%	a.	Since its founding (1989-90)	2/14%	b.	More than three years
2/14%	c.	More than two years	4/29%	d.	Less than one year
2/14%	e.	Other (please describe)			

2. Which of the following Institutes did you attend?

5/36%	a.	April 1990	7/50%	b.	October 1991	10/72%	c.	October 1993

3. Which of the following Follow-Up Meetings for teams did you attend?

5/36%	a.	June 1991	4/29%	b.	May 1993	7/50%	c.	April 1994

PART II. ASSESSMENT OF IMPACT OF THE INSTITUTES/FOLLOW-UP MEETINGS

This part of the questionnaire asks about your assessment of the impact of the Institutes and Follow-up Meetings. Even if you did not attend these events, you may have perceptions about their importance based on other information (e.g., evaluation reports, direct contact with teams).

4. Please rate the following aspects of the Institutes/Follow-up Meetings in terms of your perceptions of their importance to the subsequent work of the local teams. *Place a 1 by the item that you consider most important, a 2 by the item that is next, and so forth.* ***If you consider an item to be of no importance, do not rate it.***

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7/50%	2/14%	0/0%	2/14%	1/7%	0/0%	0/0%	a. Block of time to develop a plan
2/14%	1/7%	3/21%	2/14%	2/14%	2/14%	0/0%	b. Structure provided by action plan form
3/21%	4/29%	0/0%	0/0%	2/14%	1/7%	0/0%	c. Opportunity for team members to become acquainted
0/0%	1/7%	2/14%	3/21%	3/21%	3/21%	0/0%	d. Availability of technical assistance through round table discussions
0/0%	0/0%	3/21%	4/29%	2/14%	3/21%	0/0%	e. Opportunity to talk with state-level staff
2/14%	4/29%	4/29%	1/7%	1/7%	0/0%	0/0%	f. Opportunity to network with and learn from other teams
0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%	g. Other (please describe)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PART III. ASSESSMENT OF WORK OF THE LINKAGE TEAMS

This section asks about your knowledge/perception of the work of the linkage teams.

5. How would you characterize the nature of the work of those linkage teams with which you are familiar?

3/25% a. Collaborative, i.e., establishes joint goals and objectives that could not be achieved by a single agency or organization

3/25% b. Cooperative, i.e., helping each other achieve individual agency or organization goals and objectives

0/0% c. Still stuck on "turf" issues

0/0% d. I have no knowledge about the nature of teams' work

0/0% e. Other (please describe)

2/16% f. A & B 1/8% g. Varies (Marked A-D) 1/8% h. Rated A1 and B2

1/8% i. A, B, & C 1/8% j. Rated B1 and C2

6. Describe briefly any team accomplishments of which you are aware.
(If more convenient, record on a separate page and attach or send via e-mail to simel.1@osu.edu)

- About one-third of the Even Start project coordinators participate on linkage teams. I think in some cases linkage preceded development of the ES application, so I assume the joint planning contributed to the success of the application. In other cases, the ongoing cooperation necessary to support ES is accomplished in the linkage team.
- Participation of the alcohol and other drug treatment system.
- (1) Greene County team is part of a pilot project with OBES to share previously confidential information; (2) We are currently waiting to see if we receive a grant for the Common Good through JTPA (8% grant).
- Overall: Improved communication and coordination of services among the various agencies; Decrease in duplication of services; Greatly assisted in the co-location of many programs; Improved services to JOBS and LEAP participants; Maximized resources among the local programs.
- Pike County: Submitted a proposal for funding in June 1994. Appears that it will be funded. The group is seeking to establish day care in county - desperately needed. Group is very cohesive and moving ahead.
- The ones I'm aware of, you're aware of!
- Legislation (still to clear the Ohio Senate I believe!) to allow adults and young children on school buses - Portage County. Coordinated data collection - Licking County.
- Licking - network computers
- Familiar with most teams

7. In your judgment, would the activities listed in item 6 have been accomplished without the local linkage team(s)?

0/0% a. Yes 7/77% b. No 2/22% c. Not sure

8. What is your overall assessment of the impact of the "For the Common Good" local interagency teams?

8/57% a. They have definitely had an impact on improving services for at-risk clients.

6/42% b. They have made some changes in the way services are delivered.

0/0% c. Few, if any, differences in service delivery can be attributed to the work of local teams.

0/0% d. Other (please describe)

9. How have you acquired your knowledge of the accomplishments of the linkage teams? **Check all that apply.**

8/73% a. Attendance at Institutes

8/73% b. Attendance at Follow-up meetings

6/55% c. Direct contact with team(s)

10/91% d. Conversations with team members

0/0% e. Other (please describe)

PART IV. FOR STATE TEAM MEMBERS NOT PARTICIPATING IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

10. Please indicate why you do not feel qualified to participate in the questionnaire. **Check all that apply.**

1/33% a. I am a relatively new member of the state team.

2/66% b. I have no first hand knowledge of local team activities.

1/33% c. Because of other responsibilities, I have been unable to participate actively in state team activities.

0/0% d. Other (please describe)

Thank you very much for your cooperation in completing this questionnaire. Use the enclosed envelope to return the completed form by June 24, 1994 to: **Susan Imel, CETE, 1900 Kenny Road, Columbus, OH 43210-1090.**

APPENDIX D

TEAM ACCOMPLISHMENTS REPORTED DURING MAY 1993 FOLLOW-UP MEETING

Pell Grant
Approached School Board as a team for opening child care (evening and day)
Became part of Employment Council
Planning for 1994 Job Fair and have established subcommittees
Understood other members roles and responsibilities
Outside agencies involved to monthly meetings—better understanding
Monthly meetings used for coordination (mentioned by three teams)
Linkage Luncheons included other necessary groups and agencies and invited newspaper
Received DEOP Grant (for job search help)
Better contact with youth (GRADS/LEAP, etc.)
Hired drug and alcohol counselor
Added new members to team (mentioned by two teams)
Working on directory of services in county (mentioned by two teams)
Applied for grant for above
Reduced turf issues
Signed statement of agreement
Goal of establishing resource center
Rotating meeting sites (so everyone sees all work places)
Streamline referral and billing process (testing)
One-day retreat for team members (held at local nature site and included stress reduction walk)
Outreach worker (collaborates/contact person for all agencies)
Organized and dedicated team leader
Got reporting process in place between/among agencies
Adolescent health referral process established
PR materials are goal, including brochure, service fair
Critically analyze community needs and develop or reject ideas (prioritize)
"One Stop Shopping" Customer Service Center increased awareness, made for smoother program transitions, etc.
Committee members involve "decision makers," i.e., Directors
Held agency service day and had big turnout
Combined staff meetings
Formed tri-county literacy coalition
Each agency with team shares hosting of meetings
Streamline reporting/accountability/testing
Joint planning
Coordinated staffing
Written chronology of linkage history
Developed a communication network/processes
Quality of Family Services
Transitional housing money
Control group of families to manage through systems (case management)

Improve retention
Reduce duplication through inservice
Shared acronyms
Turned obstacles into accomplishments
Established meeting times (on regular basis)
Tutor training
MOUs
Developed trust
JOBS Contracts
Learner tracking
Send reports directly to sites, not agencies
Inter- and Intra-agency communication
Agency inservice day on regular basis